

die of this month, and that every man that values his own freedom, and is willing to strive for the freedom of all men, agree to be there on that day.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 14, 1852.

CAMPBELL SUBSCRIBERS.—We omit this week the advertisement for Campaign Subscribers, as the Presidential election will take place in a little more than two weeks, and we are now unable to supply campaign papers from the first of this month. The shortest time henceforth for which subscriptions will be received, is half a year. The attention of subscribers is invited to our standing terms, inserted below; and they are also reminded that the postage on the *Era* is now as follows:

Under the old system, the rates ranged from twenty cents a year to one dollar. A very few of the subscribers to the *Era* paid twenty cents; some, a little further off, forty cents; the great majority, sixty cents; many, among them, citizens of Wisconsin, Iowa, and Minnesota, eighty cents; while subscribers living in California, New Mexico, Oregon, and Utah, were charged a dollar. Under the new rates the postage is equalized for all distances; so that our subscribers, if they pay in advance at the offices where they receive their papers, will be charged only twenty-six cents postage a year. Let them bear this in mind.

It is to be hoped that subscribers whose terms are about to expire, will promptly renew, so as to keep up their files during the rest of the canvass, and keep themselves advised of the progress and results of the election.

As our list has now a fair start, having run up to TWENTY-ONE THOUSAND, we hope by the favor of active friends to keep it going.

STANDING TERMS.

Single copy, one year	\$2
Three copies, one year	5
Five copies, one year	8
Ten copies, one year	15
Single copy, six months	1
Ten copies, six months	8

Voluntary agents are entitled to retain 50 cents commission on each new yearly, and 25 cents on each new semi-yearly, subscriber, except in the case of clubs. Twenty-five cents is the commission on the renewal of an old subscriber.

A club of three subscribers (one of whom may be an old one) at \$5, will entitle the person making it up to a copy of the *Era* three months; a club of five (two of whom may be old ones) at \$8, to a copy for six months; a club of ten (five of whom may be old ones) at \$15, to a copy for one year.

Money to be forwarded by mail, at our risk. Large amounts may be received in drafts or certificates of deposit.

It will be seen that the price of the paper, single copy, is still \$2 a year. Agents sometimes allow a subscriber, when they obtain or renew, the benefit of their commission, so that the subscriber by their kindness gets his paper for \$1.50 or \$1.75, as the case may be.

BANKING IN THE DISTRICT.—We count, in one of our exchanges, some twenty-five private banking establishments, set up here lately. For the most part, they are irresponsible.

Occasionally, subscriptions are sent us in notes of this District. We wish now to apprise our friends that when they would send us pay in notes of the District of Columbia, they must be on one of the following banks:

Bank of Commerce, Georgetown; Hugh B. Sweeney, Cashier.
Bank of the Republic, Washington; J. W. Maury, President; Michael Smith, Cashier.
Bank of Washington, Washington; William Guntton, President; Jas. Adams, Cashier.
Patriotic Bank, Washington; G. C. Grammer, President; C. Bester, Cashier.
Exchange Bank, Washington; W. Selden, President; W. C. Bester, Cashier.
Potomac Savings Bank, Washington; John F. Callan, President; T. M. Hanson, Cashier.

THE FRIEND OF YOUTH.

The editor of the *Friend of Youth*, pressed by domestic cares, finds it necessary to transfer her paper to other hands. With the third volume, which closed on the first of this month, her connection with it terminated, and she transferred it to Grace Greenwood, as Miss Clarke is absent, however, the further publication of the paper will be deferred till her return, next spring.

DOCUMENTS FOR THE CANVASS.

The money sent us for documents are immediately handed over with the orders to A. M. Ganger, the Treasurer of the Independent Democratic Association, and there our connection with the matter ends. Should the documents fail, or be delayed, communications must be addressed to him, not to us. Some delay was unavoidable, owing to the want of funds to print the documents, but this has been overcome, and the orders, we learn, have at length been filled.

MRS STOWE, HENRY WARD BEECHER, AND THEIR ASSAILERS.

A week or two ago, the *New York Observer* made a dastardly attack on Mrs Stowe and her brother, Henry Ward Beecher, accusing the former of a libel on the Rev. Joel Parker, for which that Christian minister had brought suit against her, laying the damages at \$20,000, and charging the latter with forgery, in publishing certain letters over the signature of Joel Parker, which that gentleman never signed or authorized to be published.

The article in the *Observer* was unmanly, base, and venomous, and the editor, also a Christian minister, informed his readers that he had served it up for his "entertainment"; that he had publicly assailed a woman—a wife, a mother, a sister—as a gross libeller, and a brother minister as a forger, for the special "entertainment" of his readers! Bright exponent of Christian charity! His notion of an "entertainment" suggests the idea of the banquet on human flesh and blood, so savory in the nostrils of his New Zealand brethren.

Such an assault could not be suffered to pass unnoticed. A painful transaction thus dragged to light and horribly distorted by a diabolical ingenuity, Mr. Beecher felt constrained to publish a full statement of all the facts in the case. It occupies a large space in the columns of the *Independent*, and has also been republished in the *New York Evening Post*. We need hardly say that it is all that his best friends could wish—full, clear, well-tempered, and, as a vindication of himself and his noble sister eloquent and triumphant.

We shall publish the whole history of this transaction next week, merely calling attention now to the origin of it—the alleged libel by Mrs. Stowe.

One year ago, last August, the following language was ascribed by Mrs Stowe, in one of the chapters of *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, to Dr. Joel Parker:

"Slavery has no evils but such as are inseparable from any other relations in social and domestic life."

This language had been quoted again and again, for years, as the language of Dr. Parker. It had passed the Atlantic, and was made a subject of comment in English periodicals. It had come back, and was quoted, as from Dr. Parker, in the Annual Report of the American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, a copy of which was sent to that gentleman. He had never contradicted it—no friend had ever con-

tradicted it—its authenticity rested on the same evidence as that of the sayings attributed to other public characters. Mrs Stowe, finding it everywhere quoted, and verily believing that he belonged to the pro-slavery school of divines, introduced it in her work, not to defend Dr. Parker, but as conducive to the dramatic effect of a certain part of her story. Still, no contradiction appeared; eight months after the story was issued in book form, but not till it began to work harm, did he deny the quotation attributed to him. He wrote to Mrs Stowe, in an indignant tone, demanding a full and an instant retraction, threatening legal process should it be refused. Then commenced a correspondence between them, characterized by heat, haste, and arrogance on his part—by firmness, kindness, and an anxious desire to do justice, on her part.

It was not satisfactory to the minister, who appears to have been trained in the doctrine that implicit submission is always the duty of the woman, and so he sued her, laying the damages at \$20,000—understanding, we suppose, that this would be about the amount that Uncle Tom might yield her.

To show the immense injury sustained by this Christie-like minister! we place in parallel columns what Dr. Parker says he did say, and what Mrs Stowe, on the strength of general testimony, unimpaired at that time, quoted in her book, as spoken by him:

What he did say.	What Mrs Stowe believed he said.
"What he said, was, 'Slavery has no evils but such as are inseparable from any other relations in social and domestic life.'"	"What she believed he said, was, 'Slavery has no evils but such as are inseparable from any other relations in social and domestic life.'"

Such is the libel! It is rather hard, that having contributed but a single sentence to the book, the reverend prosecutor should now seek to secure the whole amount of its profits, and stah the reputation of its gentle author. We can tell him that his unmanly conduct in this case is calculated to do more injury to his order, than all the good his preaching has ever done it.

PRESIDENTIAL PREFERENCES OF THE FREE DEMOCRACY.

The supporters of the Pittsburgh nominations sustain them and intend to vote for them in good faith:

First, on the ground of consistency. The regularly authorized Conventions of the Democratic and Whig Parties saw proper to endorse the Compromise, and to recognize it as a final settlement of the Slave Question, to sanction the Fugitive Slave Law, and to pronounce it irrevocable. Their Presidential candidates were selected with a clear understanding that their declarations on these subjects corresponded with the views of the Conventions; and by letter they have publicly affirmed such correspondence.

To accept the candidates and reject the platform is deemed a mockery: they are one and inseparable. To "spit upon" the platform is to "spit upon" him who sustains it.

The supporters of the Pittsburgh nominations opposed the passage of the Compromise, and the Fugitive Law; they approve of neither; they do not regard the one as irrevocable, or the other as a final settlement, or any settlement at all, of the Slave Question. They are therefore constrained to oppose and vote against the platforms and candidates of the Whigs and Democrats, and to sustain and vote for their own platform and candidate, representing as they do, their views in relation to the Compromise and Fugitive Law, which are the issues forced upon them by the Slave Power.

Secondly, on the ground of policy. Acquiescence in the action of the two old parties would strengthen the power and augment the demands of Slavery; place the liberal members of those organizations at the mercy of a tyrannical Pro-Slavery Conservatism, and repress agitation. An independent political organization, representing distinctly the Sentiment of Human Freedom, openly hostile to Slavery, pledged to active resistance to its demands, and through the press and the ballot-box manifesting its purpose to establish Liberty as the Universal Law within the jurisdiction of the Federal Government, will act as a counterbalancing force to the Slave Power, keep up a Public Opinion adverse to its usurpations impose restraints upon the servility of the old Parties, in many cases be able to vindicate their political positions most conspicuous for their hostility to the Anti-Slavery cause, and at last, so far change the character of existing political organizations as to secure to the Anti-Slavery Principle its just influence in the councils of the nation. In the present contest, the Free Democracy may not carry a single State, but it will cast a decisive vote; so that it will not be difficult then to determine which of the old parties it has defeated. The simple fact that it has accomplished such a result, will teach the successful Party, moderation, and the defeated one, wisdom.

Besides—by keeping up an independent organization during the National election, a lever is secured for efficient action upon State politics. In this way, for example, the Free Democracy has succeeded in the election of three distinguished members of the United States Senate, and several able members of the House of Representatives, and in modifying to a great extent the legislation of some of the States.

This is a brief summary of the reasons on which the Free Democracy justifies its independent action.

But, while its adherents unite in this policy, clinging to it in good faith, and think it of paramount importance to make the strongest possible demonstration at the ballot-box, they are not, generally, indifferent to the result of the contest as between the two old parties. In 1844, the Liberty men were steadfast to their own organization, but some desired the election of Mr. Clay, some the election of Mr. Polk, just as they deemed the one or the other event calculated to work less mischief to their cause. We recollect well that Mr. Birney, their Presidential candidate, was unreserved in his avowal of a preference for the election of Mr. Polk, and to this avowal of opinion a very intelligent Democratic politician, in our hearing, a few days since, attributed the Democratic triumph in New York, which decided, as we know, the fate of the election of '44. Mr. Birney, it may be remembered, while a Presidential candidate, was nominated by the Democrats of his county, in Michigan, for the Legislature. In a letter, denying that any coalition had taken place, which was published in the Cincinnati Weekly Herald of October 23, 1844, was the following passage:

"I oppose the election (Mr. Clay's) because he disbelieves the great political truths of the Declaration of Independence, the foundation of all just Governments, and because he repudiates the paramount object of the Union—the perpetuation of Liberty to all. On the same ground, I oppose the election of Mr. Polk. But I more deprecate the election of Mr. Clay—because, possessing abilities superior to Mr. Polk's, he would proportionally weaken the influence of those truths on the minds of our countrymen."

In other words, he desired specially the defeat of that candidate whose election would be more dangerous to the Cause he advocated.

and yet he desired still more to see a large vote given for the Liberty nominations.

The Free Democracy is now as steadfast in supporting its own candidate as the Liberty Party was; but various opinions are entertained by its adherents in regard to the contest as between the Whigs and Democrats. Some are totally indifferent about the result—holding that both Parties are equally obnoxious, and that Liberty has as much to apprehend from the success of one as of the other.

Some would prefer to see the Whigs overthrown, for different reasons, such as: their pretensions are higher, and therefore it would be pleasant to see them more signally rebuked; or, there is a stronger natural affinity between them and the Slave Power than between it and the Democracy; or, if they are overthrown on account of their adoption of the Compromise and a Compromise candidate, they will be obliged at once to assume Anti-Slavery ground, and the Democratic Party would then be compelled to pursue a liberal course on the Slave Question, or be split by the outward pressure of Anti-Slavery Sentiment and the internal action of its Anti-Slavery members: which would not happen, should the Democrats be defeated; for they would then, Anti-Slavery and Pro-Slavery Democrats, rally again, in combination with the Slave Power, to regain their ascendancy, while the Whigs, in power, would pursue, while the Administration has done for the last three years, a Pro-Slavery line of policy. In confirmation of the last view, we are referred to the condition of Parties under Mr. Polk's Administration, when the Whigs, a member of the United States Senate, was elected, in the Northern States, being out of power, took an Anti-Slavery position, and the Democrats, being in power, divided on the Slave Issue. On the other hand, the Whigs, in power, under Mr. Fillmore, backed out of their Anti-Slavery position, and the Democrats, out of power, reunited their forces upon a platform dictated by the Slave Power.

Others, in the language of Mr. Birney, "more deprecate" the election of Mr. Pierce, and for various reasons. He accepts the nomination for the Presidency, and the platform, because he cordially approves of the principles of the latter: General Scott accepts the nomination, and the platform, but the latter, evidently, as an acquiescence. The Democratic platform was adopted in the Democratic Convention without dissent, or a division: the Whig platform was adopted by the Whig Convention, after a sharp struggle, and in opposition to sixty-six negatives. Gen. Pierce was the chosen nominee of the ultra Pro-Slavery members of the Democratic Convention: General Scott was the chosen nominee of those members of the Whig Convention, who specially resisted the adoption of the Compromise and Fugitive Law. The two candidates occupy the same ground in relation to these measures, but there is reason to believe that Slavery Propagandism will be winked at by Gen. Pierce, discountenanced by Gen. Scott. Plots for the annexation of Cuba, and the dismemberment of Mexico, are thickening. In the character of Gen. Pierce, in his party training, in the history of the influences which secured his nomination, there is no reason to hope that he would interpose against these hopeful schemes: while the character, position, and relations of Gen. Scott do authorize the expectation of such interposition, should he be elected—not so much because of any Anti-Slavery sentiment he may entertain, but because of that natural Conservatism of the Whig Party, which shrinks even from real progress, lest it may disturb existing relations. Above all, the Democratic Party is the strong Party of the country. It never shrinks from taking the responsibility, and if it succeeded on a false Principle, it will not hesitate to bring all the powerful machinery at its command, to enforce that Principle. Defeat it, whenever it assumes a false position on the question of Slavery, and it will eventually take a true one; and in that case, its action on the question would be energetic and conclusive, not like that of the Whigs—feeble, hesitating, and compromising.

Such are the different views entertained by different classes of Free Democrats. It is not worth while to discuss these general preferences, so long as they lead to no divided councils or action. It is a matter of little moment what the views of a supporter of the Pittsburgh nominations are, respecting the election of Gen. Pierce or Gen. Scott, so long as he holds it of paramount importance to secure for that large vote. Such views may give a certain direction to his efforts, but will not interfere with their great aim. If he believe that both the old Parties occupy precisely the same position, and that Liberty has no more to hope, or to apprehend from one than the other, he will be equally free to direct his blows against both with equal force. If he "more deprecate" the election of Scott than Pierce, he will be the former; or, if he "more deprecate" the election of Pierce than Scott, he will probably bestow more attention on the former, and labor more particularly to win Democratic converts.

Let every one work according to his own convictions, and not question the honesty of his fellow-Laborers.

These remarks are suggested by assaults which have lately been made upon some of our Free Democratic friends by the Scott and Pierce organs in this city. The *Republic* accuses Mr. Giddings of combining with Democrats to defeat General Scott, and the *National Era* is also denounced in the same style. This is all unjust and libellous. Mr. Giddings, Mr. Hale, Mr. Chase, the *National Era*, are all working in union to secure support for the Pittsburgh nominations; and if one appeals more particularly to one class of voters, and another, to another class, it is for reasons, such as we have exhibited in all frankness, and not with a view to dishonest coalition with any other Party.

PARTISANSHIP.

The Union is unscrupulous as a partisan journal; so is the *Republic*. We have just noticed the inexcusable conduct of the former towards Mr. Corwin. The *Republic* manifests a kindred spirit in its treatment of Mr. Soule, one of the Senators from Louisiana. For some time it has been insinuating that that gentleman, appointed on a Committee of the Senate to investigate certain corrupt transactions, has been neglecting his duties, for the purpose of electioneering for Pierce, and at the same time receiving pay as a member of said committee. The character of that gentleman ought to have forbidden such an insinuation; but nothing is sacred against cold-blooded, inquisitorial partisanship.

The attention of Mr. Soule, on his return to Washington a few days since, was called to these assaults upon his conduct, and he authorized the *Union* to say, "though reluctant to descend so far as to notice such insinuations, that he receives no pay for services which he does not render: that he has taken, and means to take, nothing from the Government for what labor he may have to perform during the recess of Congress; and that he will have good cause to feel his 'electioneering tours' cause no detriment to the public seal, and be no obstacle to the elucidation of the transactions in the investigation of which he is engaged."

A fair-minded man, not embittered by the spirit of partisanship, would have received such an explanation gladly, and apologized courteously for any suspicion he might have expressed—but how does the *Republic* receive it? It publishes it, and adds—

"We have nothing to retract, and feel under no obligation to apologize. Our inquiries related to the conduct of Mr. Soule in his public capacity, and were justified by his prolonged absence from the Senate assigned to him by the Senate. Mr. Soule has directed the publication of a reply, and we communicate its purport to our readers; and so the matter rests, without favor or apology on either side."

How rudely the partisan tramples upon the amenities of life! Why should ordinary courtesy be deemed out of place in our political controversies? Where we have positive evidence of rascality, apply the word and produce the evidence; but by what rule of justice or good manners are we to suspect, insinuate, or charge rascality, because a man happens to entertain a different view of politics from that held by us?

MR. CORWIN AND THE GARDINER CLAIM.
Private character is so sacred, that no matter who may be the assailed, though a personal or political foe, if a gross charge against him be related, we always take pleasure in recording the fact.

It will be recollected that certain enemies of Thomas Corwin, Secretary of the Treasury, had impeached his integrity in connection with the famous Gardiner claim. The subject was brought to the attention of the House of Representatives at its late session, and a committee appointed to investigate his relations to that claim. It was composed of Preston King, Volney E. Howard, and Andrew Johnson, Democrats, Messrs. Chapman and Goodrich, Whigs. It is well understood that King and Johnson have always been zealous in detecting and exposing corruption in high places.

The Committee has been in session a large portion of the time since the adjournment of Congress, and its investigation has been thorough and comprehensive.

A few days since it closed its work, and rendered a unanimous report, signed by King and Howard, Democrats, and Chapman, Whig—Johnson, Democrat, and Goodrich, Whig, being absent.

The report, we regard, as a complete refutation of the base charges against Mr. Corwin, and we transfer all that portion of it which relates to his connection with the claim:

"In relation to the second branch of the inquiry, the connection of the Hon. Thomas Corwin, the present Secretary of the Treasury, with the said Gardiner claim, the following facts appear from the testimony upon the points directed by the resolution to be investigated: In May, 1849, the Hon. Thomas Corwin, then a member of the United States Senate, was employed as counsel in the Gardiner claim, by Hon. Waddy Thompson, the original claimant of Gardiner, upon an agreement that Mr. Corwin should have for his fee five per cent. on whatever sum should be awarded to Gardiner by the Commissioners. In February, 1850, Thomas Corwin, in company with Robert G. Corwin, purchased one-fourth part of the claim of Gardiner, and this fourth part of said claim was assigned on the 13th of that month to W. W. Corcoran, Esq., who loaned money to the Messrs. Corwin to purchase it, and held the claim for Corwin, Thamas and Robert G. Corwin, in equal shares, and for the purpose of the payment of the loan. The Messrs. Corwin paid \$22,000, and relinquished their fees on the fourth part of the claim purchased by them, and paid a part of Edward Curtis's fees—what amount does not appear—as the consideration for the purchase."

"The Hon. Thomas Corwin resigned his seat in the Senate, and accepted the appointment of Secretary of the Treasury, in the month of July, 1850. In the same month, and previous to his going into the Cabinet of President Fillmore, as Secretary of the Treasury, a sale of his fee interest in, and also of his half of the one-fourth part of the Gardiner claim, was negotiated through the intervention of Gov. John Young, of New York, to George Law, Esq., of New York. From this time the said Thomas Corwin refused to act as counsel, or consult with the other counsel who had been associated with him in relation to the same, and took no further part in the prosecution of the said Gardiner claim. The assignment of his fee interest and his interest in the one-fourth part of the other claim, and all his interest in all other claims before the Board of Commissioners (thirty-seven in number) was executed by Thomas Corwin to Jacob Little, of New York, in November, 1850, and the money for the purchase was then paid by George Law, to whom the assignment to Jacob Little was at that time transferred."

The money for the sale, \$80,357, was received by Thomas Corwin, and on the 23d of November was deposited by him to his credit with Messrs. Corcoran & Riggs. No testimony has been adduced before the committee proving, or tending to prove, that the Hon. Thomas Corwin had any knowledge that the claim of said Gardiner was fraudulent, or that he had money or forged papers had been or were to be procured to sustain the same."

NO TESTIMONY HAS BEEN ADDUCED BEFORE THIS COMMITTEE PROVEING, OR TENDING TO PROVE, THAT THE SAID THOMAS CORWIN HAD ANY KNOWLEDGE THAT THE CLAIM OF SAID GARDINER WAS FRAUDULENT, OR THAT FALSE TESTIMONY OR FORGED PAPERS HAD BEEN OR WERE TO BE PROCURED TO SUSTAIN THE SAME.

It is also shown that the sum of eighty thousand dollars was paid him, for his interest in this claim alone, but for his interest in thirty-seven other claims, before the Board; that this sale was made before his entrance into the Cabinet; and that after his entrance, he had nothing to do with it, refusing to act as counsel, or to consult with the other counsel who had been associated in the case.

We notice in the *Union*, a desperate attempt, in the face of this report, to insinuate that Mr. Corwin, in the alleged fraud of Gardiner, although it knows very well that had there been any evidence on this point, the Committee, of which a majority were Democrats, would have found it out. The Committee says, on the contrary, "No testimony has been adduced before the Committee, proving, or tending to prove, that the Hon. Thomas Corwin had any knowledge that the claim of said Gardiner was fraudulent, or that false testimony or forged papers had been or were to be presented to sustain the same."

It is true that the Board of Commissioners at first looked upon the claim with suspicion; but such evidence was produced as satisfied all the members of it that it was valid. Besides, had not this evidence been strong, it is not to be supposed that the New York speculators, always wide awake to their own interests, would have paid so much for Mr. Corwin's interest, before the decision of the Board.

The *New York Evening Post* wonders how the fraudulent nature of the claim could be unknown by Mr. Corwin, when the Committee came so promptly to the conclusion that it was a fraud! Mr. Corwin was engaged as counsel more than two years ago. Much has transpired during the two years in relation to the claim of which he then knew nothing, but of which the Committee had the benefit in their investigation. As the Committee state distinctly, that no evidence was produced before them tending to prove that Mr. Corwin knew that there was fraud, we cannot but think that the *Post* is guilty of great injustice to the *Post*, in calling in question his integrity, upon no evidence whatever.

As for the *Union*, it is a mere partisan, and therefore holds private character as nothing compared with some petty party advantage.

In regard to this Gardiner claim, the Committee was not under instruction to investigate its merits or demerits. The House of Representatives assumed that it was a suspicious claim, and desired simply to ascertain Mr. Corwin's connection with it, as the following resolution, under which the Committee was constituted, will show:

"Whereas a strong suspicion rests upon the public mind that fraudulent claims have been allowed by the said Thomas Corwin, in connection with one of which it is suspected that Thomas Corwin, Secretary of the Treasury, has been improperly connected; therefore,

"Resolved, That a committee, consisting of five members of this House, be appointed by the Speaker, to investigate all the facts touching the connection of the said Thomas Corwin, the present Secretary of the Treasury, with the said Gardiner claim; what fee, if any, he was to receive for his services as agent or counsel for said Gardiner; what interest, if any, other than his fee interest, he purchased and held either directly or indirectly in said claim, and the amount paid or stipulated to be paid therefor, and conditions of such purchase; at what time he ceased to act as the counsel or agent of said Gardiner; to whom and for what consideration he disposed of his fee interest; to whom and for what consideration he disposed of his one-fourth interest in said claim."

The Committee, however, undertook to look into the nature of the claim itself. This was going beyond their instructions, and was clearly unjust to Gardiner. He is already in the hands of the law, subject to five different prosecutions, and his claim is to undergo a thorough judicial investigation. Under such circumstances, we submit that no *ex parte* examination or opinion should be suffered to prejudice his case. We know nothing of the man, or his character; but, suppose his claim to be a valid one, he is in the hands of the law, and is entitled to a fair trial, without prejudice or partiality.

With the political position of Mr. Corwin we have no sympathy—we believe he is in a place where the best impulses of his nature are constantly curbed—but we esteem him as a man, and rejoice that the miserable charges against him are refuted.

For the National Era.

ASTREA.

—Jove means to settle
Asteria in her seat again,
And let down from his golden chain
An age of better metal.
—Ben Jonson, 1615.

Oh, poet, rare and old!
Thy words are prophecies:
Forward the Age of Gold,
The new Saturnian lies.
The universal prayer
And hope are not in vain;
Rise, brothers! and prepare
The brother's Saturn's reign.

Perish shall all which takes
From labor's hand and can;
Perish shall all which makes
A spaniel of the man!

Free from its bonds the mind,
The body from the rod,
Broken all chains that bind
The image of our God.

Just men no longer pine
Behind their prison bars;
Through the rent dungeon shine
The free sun and the stars.

Earth, once at last, untrod
By sect, or caste, or clan,
The Fatherhood of God,
The Brotherhood of Man!

Friend, laid, craft, perish, forth!
The money-changers driven,
And God's will done on earth
As now in Heaven!

J. G. W.

UNCLE TOM'S CABIN.—A correspondent at Washington, Pa., writes:

"Uncle Tom's Cabin is now denounced by time-serving preachers as a meretricious work. Will you not come out in defence of it, and roll back the tide of vituperation?"

We should as soon think of coming out in defence of Shakespeare. The people everywhere have stamped it, good and great. Of the first edition, large type and beautifully embellished, thirty thousand copies, it is stated, have been sold in England; of the shilling railway edition, ninety-five thousand; of the illustrated penny edition, thirteen of which have been issued twenty-five thousand, weekly. And in the *London Morning Advertiser* of Sept. 29th, Uncle Tom's Cabin is announced to be played in the theatres of that city, viz: the "Royal Victoria" and the "Great National Standard Theatre."

In this country, its circulation, we know, is unparalleled. By a note from the publishers, we learn that a translation into German, by one of the best German scholars of the country, is now nearly completed, and will soon be put to press. They hope to get it out at 50 cents a copy, so as to place it in the hands of every reading German in the United States. They also say that they are preparing a superb edition for Christmas and New Year's, to contain 100 engravings, in the highest style of art, from original designs by Billings.

A work which has set all the world to talking about, which is circulated by hundreds of thousands, which is passing into other languages, which is set to music, and which is dramatized, and the demand for which is increasing every hour, needs no defence against any assailant.

PORTRAITS OF JOHN F. HALE.

WE HAVE BEEN FAVORED WITH FOUR different portraits of this eminent man—a fair indication of his popularity and good looks. The first is a steel engraving, by Pelton, from a daguerotype, and published by W. H. Cushing, 196, Broadway street. It is a fair likeness, but altogether too dark and swarthy a countenance. The second is a steel engraving, very nicely executed by J. C. Buttre, of New York, from a daguerotype by J. Garney, and published by Carter & Conant, 4 Cornhill Court, Boston. This is also a fair likeness, but altogether too dark and swarthy a countenance. The third is a lithograph by H. Hoffman, Upham, & Co., from a drawing by A. Hoffman, and published by John P. Jewett & Co. This, though fairly executed, is in our opinion, the poorest likeness of the lot, suffering as well from the fact as from the execution of the artist. The fourth is a lithograph by Tappan & Bradford, from a daguerotype by Massey & Silbee, and published by the Commonwealth office. Though emanating from this establishment, we are nevertheless bound to say that the last is decidedly the best likeness of the face, as well as of the countenance, ever of them. In corroboration of our opinion, Rev. Mr. Buckingham, of Dover, who for twenty years has been the pastor of Mr. Hale, unqualifiedly asserts that no better likeness of his distinguished parishioner can be produced. This likeness can be had in any number at our counting-room.

We have seen but two—the one issued from the Commonwealth office, the other by Jewett & Co. Both are strong likenesses, but both must have been taken just after Mr. Hale had received the news of his nomination.

THE ANTI-SLAVERY STANDARD OF NEW YORK, a paper not in fellowship with the Free Democratic party, says of the nomination of Mr. Tompkins for Governor:

"The nomination of Mr. Tompkins will doubtless be a very popular one, and command the assent of all who are in any way susceptible of the views which will attract to their standard many of the Democrats who hang loosely upon their old party connections, as his name alone is one which will insure enthusiasm. He is a son of the late Daniel D. Tompkins, the most popular Governor the State ever had, one of the most capable and useful men the State has produced, and Vice President of the United States under the administration of Monroe."

CUBA AND REVOLUTIONARY MOVEMENTS.

It is difficult to form a correct opinion of the state of things in Cuba, from the accounts published in the newspapers. These accounts generally are one-sided, and seem to be exaggerated. That an organization exists in this country, intended to aid revolutionary movements in that island, is notorious. Its policy, of course, is to foster such movements, to magnify them, to excite the public mind both here and in Cuba, and to exhibit the conduct of the authorities there in the worst light. And it may be fairly presumed that its secret agents are disposed, in the furtherance of its schemes, to take advantage of the facilities of commercial and social intercourse between Havana and the principal seaports in our country.

Nearly all the arrivals lately have brought news of discontent, insurrections, revolutionary attempts, on one side, and the most arbitrary and severe measures of repression on the other.

Lately there have been demonstrations of hostility towards certain American vessels, and the sympathizing press among us, without inquiring whether such vessels had not given provocation to the Spanish authorities, has denounced such hostility in the fiercest terms, calling upon our Government for retaliation. "The ship Correlia," says the *New York Tribune*, "was arrested and searched in the harbor of Havana, on the charge of having a passenger on board, without a passport. The man was sought for, and not found; but in his stead another, who was provided with a passport, was seized, dragged from the protection of the American flag, and cast into prison. Broken open and ransacked, and those letters which the police suspected of evil, were taken from it. As matters now stand, this is intolerable. A more decided outrage could not be committed upon our flag; and we wait impatiently for further explanations from the other party."

Is it not probable that the provocation was great? Might not this vessel